

Remarks

This Reply is in response to the Final Office Action mailed January 6, 2010.

I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections

Prior to the Office Action mailed January 6, 2010, Claims 1-11, 13, 15-39, 41, 43-67, 69, 71-84 and 91-96 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, the Specification was objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. Claims 1-11, 13, 15-39, 41, 43-67, 69, 71-84 and 91-96 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 1, 29, 57 and 91-96 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Parker et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0010607, hereinafter Parker). Claims 1-11, 13, 15-39, 41, 43-67, 69, 71-84 and 91-96 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gong (U.S. Publication No. 2004/064733) in view of DeBry (U.S. Patent No. 6,385,728) and further in view of Parker (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0010607). Claims 17-18, 45-46 and 73-74 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gong, DeBry and Parker and further in view of Jhingan (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0186851).

II. Summary of Applicants' Amendments

The present Response hereby amends Claims 1, 29 and 57, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 1-11, 13, 15-39, 41, 43-67, 69, 71-84 and 91-96. Reconsideration of the Application in light of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

III. Specification

In the Office Action mailed January 6, 2010, the Specification was objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. More specifically, the limitation "changes made by the file sharer to the file in the original location are reflected in the proxy representation provided to the remote user" previously recited in Claims 1, 29 and 57 was rejected as not being found in the Specification. In addition, the limitation "automatically logs into the file source by using the credentials and updates the file in the original location from which the file was originally retrieved" recited in Claims 92, 94 and 96 was rejected as not having been discussed in the Specification.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. The above mentioned limitations are described in the

Specification as originally filed. For example, with respect to Claims 92, 94 and 96, support for the limitation "automatically logs into the file source by using the credentials and updates the file in the original location from which the file was originally retrieved" can be found in paragraphs 23, 34 and 52 of the Specification (see "In some embodiments, the proxy server 125 maintains login credentials which enable it to access data stored on the file sources" (par. 23). "proxy server 125 logs in and interacts with the file source" (par. 34). "The proxy server 125, using the internal credentials provided by the sharer of the file, modifies the file." (par. 52))

Nevertheless, while Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection, for purposes of expediting the prosecution of this Application, the present Response hereby amends Claims 1, 29 and 57 so as to more closely match the language used in the Specification. Applicant respectfully submits that in light of the amendment to the Claims, the Specification now provides proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

IV. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph

In the Office Action mailed January 6, 2010, Claims 1-11, 13, 15-39, 41, 43-67, 69, 71-84 and 91-96 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. More specifically, the limitation "changes made by the file sharer to the file in the original location are reflected in the proxy representation provided to the remote user" previously recited in Claims 1, 29 and 57 was rejected as not being found in the Specification. In addition, the limitation "automatically logs into the file source by using the credentials and updates the file in the original location from which the file was originally retrieved" recited in Claims 92, 94 and 96 was rejected as not having been discussed in the Specification.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. The above mentioned limitations are described in the Specification as originally filed. For example, with respect to Claims 92, 94 and 96, support for the limitation "automatically logs into the file source by using the credentials and updates the file in the original location from which the file was originally retrieved" can be found in paragraphs 23, 34 and 52 of the Specification (see "In some embodiments, the proxy server 125 maintains login credentials which enable it to access data stored on the file sources" (par. 23). "proxy server 125 logs in and interacts with the file source" (par. 34). "The proxy server 125, using the internal credentials provided by the sharer of the file, modifies the file." (par. 52))

Nevertheless, while Applicant respectfully disagrees with this rejection, for purposes of

expediting the prosecution of this Application, the present Response hereby amends Claims 1, 29 and 57 so as to more closely match the language used in the Specification. Applicant respectfully submits that in light of the amendment to the Claims, the Specification now provides proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

V. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

In the Office Action mailed January 6, 2010, Claims 1, 29, 57 and 91-96 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Parker et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0010607, hereinafter Parker).

Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly distinguish the embodiment therein. As amended, Claim 1 currently defines:

1. *A method for sharing files with remote users, the method comprising:
accepting, at a proxy server, a request from a file sharer to share a file in an original file location of the file sharer with a remote user, the file located at a file source inside an internal private network of the file sharer, said private network having a firewall;
generating a proxy representation on the proxy server wherein the proxy representation enables remote access to modify the file in the original location inside the private network, wherein the proxy representation contains location information used by the proxy server to locate the file inside said private network, and wherein the proxy representation contains stored credentials of the file sharer that are needed to access the file on the file source;
accessing the proxy representation by the remote user that resides externally with respect to the internal private network, wherein the remote user submits one or more modifications to the file by accessing the proxy representation on the proxy server;
receiving the one or more modifications to the file via the proxy representation; and
using the credentials of the file sharer to update the file in the original location inside the internal private network based on the modifications to the proxy representation received at the proxy server wherein the proxy server updates the file by using the location information contained in the proxy representation;
wherein after the updating, when the file sharer accesses the file in the original location, changes to the proxy representation made by the remote user are reflected in the file in the original location.*

As amended, Claim 1 currently defines a method for a user to share his or her original file with a remote user. For example, the file can reside on the user's local desktop and he or she may submit the file share request with a remote user. As part of this request, the user submits his/her credentials that are necessary to access/modify the file. The proxy server then generates a proxy that will enable the remote user to access the original file on the user's desktop inside of the private network of the file sharer. This proxy contains location information used by the proxy server to locate the file inside said private network, and also contains the credentials of the file sharer that are needed to access the file.

Once the proxy is generated, the remote user can access and submit various modifications to the file by accessing the proxy on the proxy server. Once these modifications are submitted by the remote user, the proxy server uses the credentials of the original file sharer to log into the file source, locate the file and update it with the modifications. The proxy server can also modify an existing proxy representation upon determining that the original file has been modified.

The advantages of the features defined in Claim 1 include the ability of the user to share access to his file on his local desktop with remote users, without the need to send the file or upload it to some shared location. Access to the actual user's original file is provided over a proxy server and modifications are updated by both users, as if the remote user was the original file sharer himself accessing the original file.

Parker teaches a collaborative file update system. More specifically, Parker discloses a system where an initial version of the file is accepted from one of a plurality of users. This initial version designates one or more recipients of the initial version. "Then, for each one of a plurality of sequentially updated versions of the file, data is accepted from one of the plurality of users. The data is representative of a difference between the updated version and the immediately previous version of the file. Data representative of the updated version of the file is transmitted to the designated recipients of the updated version." (par. 6-7). The "data transmitted to each recipient ... consists substantially of the difference between the updated version of the file and the previous version of the file." (par. 9) Additionally, "users designated as recipients of the updated version but not the immediately previous version receive data of the updated file itself rather than a delta from any previous version." (par. 10).

As evident from the above description, Parker appears to disclose a system where a user uploads a file to a server where he or she would like to have multiple recipients to have access to the file. Then, as each user modifies the file, the differences (or the new version of the file itself) are

transmitted to each recipient entitled to view it. However, Applicant respectfully submits that Parker fails to anticipate the features defined in Claim 1, as amended.

In particular, Claim 1 allows access to the original file on the file sharer's desktop to a remote user. In contrast, Parker uploads the file to a shared location and transmits the updated versions to the recipients as revisions are made. This directly indicates that Parker maintains a separate copy of the file for each designated recipient and then distributes the changes to these recipients so that their individual copy is up-to-date. Claim 1 does not transmit any updates to the remote users because it is the original file on the original file sharer's desktop that is modified. Instead, Claim 1 specifically enables access to this file by generating a proxy, without uploading the original file and without transmitting it to any users.

Moreover, Claim 1 specifically defines that when the modifications to the file proxy are received from the remote user, the proxy server uses the *file sharer's credentials* to update the original file on the file source. In contrast, Parker distributes the changes to the recipients whenever changes are made. Thus, changes to file in Parker are not updated using the original file sharer's credentials, as defined in Claim 1. Rather, the only form of authorization disclosed in Parker is the server determining whether the file recipients are allowed access to the file. Nowhere in Parker does the server use the credentials of the original file sharer to actually update the original file.

In Claim 1, the remote users are not provided their own versions of the file. Rather, the remote user is provided access to the original file over a proxy. Thus, the proxy server of Claim 1 needs the file sharer's credentials to update the original file with the changes. This type of functionality is not at all disclosed in Parker, which mainly keeps track of changes by distributing the changes to each recipient.

In view of Parker's lack of disclosure, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1, as amended, is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of Parker, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 29 and 57

Claims 29 and 57, while independently patentable, recite limitations that, similarly to those described above with respect to Claim 1, are not taught, suggested nor otherwise rendered obvious by the cited references. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

VI. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

In addition to Parker (discussed above), the Office Action cited Gong (Publication No. 2004/0064733) and DeBry (U.S. Patent No. 6,385,728) to reject the features defined in Claim 1.

Gong teaches concurrent version control and information management of files sent as attachments through email. More specifically, Gong teaches an IMS server that keeps track of multiple versions of attachments emailed to multiple users. The IMS server manages all the check-in, check-out and modification activities by the different users that have access to the attachment (Gong, par. [0009]).

DeBry teaches the methods for providing will-call certificates for guaranteeing authorization for a printer to retrieve a file directly from a file server upon request from a client. More particularly, DeBry describes a system where a client obtains a "will-call certificate" from a file source and then provides this certificate to a print server. The print server then uses the will-call certificate to print out the file directly from the file source. This way, the client system is able to print out the file without ever actually receiving a copy of the file (DeBry, Abstract).

However, similarly to Parker, Gong and DeBry also fail to disclose the features defined in Claim 1, as discussed above. For example, both Gong and DeBry fail to disclose that the proxy stores a set of credentials of the file sharer and that the proxy server uses these credentials to access the file and update it with modifications made to the proxy, as defined in Claim 1.

Gong deals with an email attachment and not with accessing the original file. More specifically, once the attachment is received for multiple recipients, Gong allows them to check out the attachment and check it back in when finished. However, Claim 1 does not require that the user send the file as an email attachment, nor does Claim 1 perform check-out and check-in activities of any attachment (Gong, par. 9). Rather, Claim 1 specifically generates a proxy that allows access directly back to the original file on the file sharer's desktop. The remote user can access the original file by using the proxy and can modify it as if he were the file sharer himself by using the credentials of the file sharer maintained on the proxy server.

Similarly, DeBry provides a way for printers to print files, however DeBry does not allow users to share file access and specifically does not allow remote users to modify the original file on the file sharer's desktop. Moreover, DeBry does not disclose any proxy server that uses the credentials of the file sharer to update the original file based on modifications to the proxy, as defined in Claim 1.

In view of the above comments and amendments, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim

1, as amended, is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 29 and 57

Claims 29 and 57, while independently patentable, recite limitations that, similarly to those described above with respect to Claim 1, are not taught, suggested nor otherwise rendered obvious by the cited references. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-11, 13, 15-28, 30-39, 41, 43-56, 58-67, 69, 71-84 and 91-96

Claims 2-11, 13, 15-28, 30-39, 41, 43-56, 58-67, 69, 71-84 and 91-96 are not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the comments provided above. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2-11, 13, 15-28, 30-39, 41, 43-56, 58-67, 69, 71-84 and 91-96 are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

It is also submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

VII. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 5, 2010

By: /Justas Geringson/
Justas Geringson
Reg. No. 57,033

Customer No. 23910
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800